	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/789,135	OLANDER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOHN HEFFINGTON	2179	

All Participants:

(1) _JOHN HEFFINGTON_.

(2) _Ted Liu_.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _29 June 2010_

Time: _____

Type of Interview:
- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
    If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
35 USC 102 rejection under Burd

Claims discussed:
independent claims 1 and 27

Prior art documents discussed:
Burd

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested that the applicant amend independent claims 1 and 27 to claim that the control tree is instantiated on a server in response to a request from a client, GUI controls were classes, and that GUI controls could be dynamically added to the control tree during a lifecycle..